



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

This decision following *Lehigh Valley R. Co. v. Pennsylvania*, 145 U. S. 192 adds to the weight of authority. But see *State v. Chicago, St. P. M. & O. R. Co.*, 40 Minn. 267; and *New Orleans Cotton Exchange v. Cincinnati, N. O. & T. P. R. Co.*, 2 Inters. Com. Rep. 289. Where there are connecting carriers the rule is in doubt, *Sternberger v. Railroad Co.* 29 S. C. 510; *Leavell v. West. Union Tel. Co.*, 116 N. C. 211. When the state attempts to "regulate" rates under such circumstances it acts without authority. *Hanley v. Kansas City Southern R. Co.*, 187 U. S. 617.

**LIBEL—PRIVILEGE.—PREWITT v. WILSON**, 105 N. W. 365 (Ia.).—*Held*, that a defamatory publication concerning a candidate for public office is privileged but only conditionally.

There is a direct conflict of authority on this point. Some courts hold that such publications are to be considered on the same basis as an ordinary writing. *Post Pub. Co. v. Hallans*, 59 Fed. 530; *Root v. King*, 7 Cow. (N. Y.) 613. Others hold that they are conditionally privileged; that is, if made in good faith, even though false, the writer is not liable. *State v. Balch*, 31 Kan. 465; *Marks v. Baker*, 28 Minn. 162. It must not be reckless repetition of a rumor but must be on probable cause. *Burke v. Mascarick*, 81 Cal. 302; *Briggs v. Garrett*, 111 Pa. St. 404. The reason is that each elector has the right to discuss and inform others as to his belief in the fitness or unfitness of the candidate. However, it must be published solely for the purpose of informing other electors or the writer will be liable. *State v. Keenan*, 82 N. W. 792 (Ia.). The ruling in the principal case is, therefore, in accordance with the general rule and prior decisions in Iowa. *Bays v. Hunt*, 60 Ia. 251.

**MASTER AND SERVANT—OWNER'S DUTY TOWARD CONTRACTOR'S SERVANT.—STEVENS v. UNITED GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.**, 60 ALT. 848 (N. H.).—Where servant of an independent contractor, while engaged in erecting a power house for defendant is injured by defectively insulated wires maintained on the premises by the defendant, *held*, that the defendant is liable since he owed him the non-delegable duty of protection from concealed dangers. Young, J. *dissenting*.

The liability here is analogous to that of the owner of real estate who is held responsible for the injuries of those expressly or impliedly invited on his premises. *Johnson v. Spear*, 76 Mich. 139. The relation of master and servant does not subsist between proprietor and a servant of contractor; only that of landowner and invitee. *Thompson, Negligence*, §§ 680, 979; *Huffcut, Agency*, 278. Must warn them of all danger. *Erickson v. Railroad*, 41 Minn. 500, and is responsible if injured by instrumentalities he has furnished. *Coughtay v. Woolen Co.*, 56 N. Y. 124. Although the owner's liability has not been recognized in some cases, where the contractor has full control over the servants and premises. *Reier v. Detroit Steel & Spring Works*, 109 Mich. 244. The owner's responsibility where contractor has such control would be the same as a landlord to his tenant's servant, *Towne v. Thompson*, 68 N. H. 317, except that owner must not contract for a nuisance. *Brannock v. Elmore*, 114 Mo. 55.

**MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—LIABILITY FOR NEGLIGENCE—MAINTENANCE OF SEWERS.—LOCKWOOD v. CITY OF DOVER**, 61 ATL. 32, (N. H.).—*Held*, that